

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.		F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
	10/631,923	3 07/31/2003		Raya Levin	4517-4002	9017	
	27123	7590	09/20/2005		EXAM	EXAMINER	
			EGAN, L.L.P.		LISH, PETER J		
	3 WORLD FINANCIAL CENTER NEW YORK, NY 10281-2101				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
					1754		

DATE MAILED: 09/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Asticus Commons	10/631,923	LEVIN ET AL.	•
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Peter J. Lish	1754	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence ad	ddress
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin 17 rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from 18 cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. imely filed in the mailing date of this of ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 Ju	<u>ıly 2004</u> .		
	action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowan	ice except for formal matters, pr	osecution as to th	e merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims		·	
4) Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.			
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw			
5) Claim(s)is/are allowed.			
6)☐ Claim(s) is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) <u>1-26</u> are subject to restriction and/or e	lection requirement.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner	•		
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acce		Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the o			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti	•	• •	FR 1,121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex		•	• •
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			. •
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 25 H S C & 110/c	n) (d) or (f)	
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	phonty under 35 O.S.C. 9 119(a	i)-(a) or (i).	
1. Certified copies of the priority documents	have been received		
2. Certified copies of the priority documents		tion No	
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priori			Stage
application from the International Bureau	•	oz wo manoma.	Clago
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of		ed.	
Attachment(s)			
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary		
2)	Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F		O-152)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:		- //

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-3 and 16-22, drawn to a calcium carbonate powder, classified in class 423, subclass 430.
- II. Claims 4-15 and 22, drawn to a mixture of particles, classified in class 366, subclass 348.
- III. Claims 23-25, drawn to a granulation process, classified in class 23, subclass 313R.
- IV. Claim 26, drawn to a process for making a calcium carbonate composition, classified in class 424, subclass 687.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions have different functions, Group I being drawn to a calcium carbonate product and Group II being drawn to a generic powder.

Inventions I and III are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different

Application/Control Number: 10/631,923

Art Unit: 1754

inventions have different function, Group I being drawn to a calcium carbonate product and Group III being drawn to a method of granulating generic particles.

Inventions I and IV are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions the different inventions have different functions, Group I being drawn to a calcium carbonate product and Group IV being drawn to a method of making a composition containing a variety of ingredients.

Inventions II and III are at best related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the process can be used to make other and materially different product, such as powders having a variety of particle size distributions outside the claimed ranges.

Inventions II and IV are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions have different functions, Group II being drawn to a generic powder and Group IV being drawn to a method of making a composition containing a variety of ingredients.

Inventions III and IV are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different

Application/Control Number: 10/631,923

Art Unit: 1754

inventions have different functions, Group III being drawn to a process for granulating generic particles and Group IV being drawn to a method of making a composition containing a variety of ingredients.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

A telephone call was made to Richard Komson on 9/7/05 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter J. Lish whose telephone number is 571-272-1354. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00-6:00 Monday through Friday.

Application/Control Number: 10/631,923

Art Unit: 1754

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stanley Silverman can be reached on 571-272-1358. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PL

STANLEY S. SILVERMAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700

Page 5